REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application, as amended, is respectfully requested. Claims 1-6 have been amended. Claims 7-14 have been added and no claims have been canceled. As such, claims 1-14 are currently pending in the present application.

Claims 3-5 stand objected to for various informalities. Claims 3-5 have been amended in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions. Applicants respectfully request that the objection to claims 3-5 be withdrawn.

Claims 1-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The antecedent basis of the terms "application," "look," and "feel" recited in claims 1 and 6 have been corrected. The step of "receiving requests...service implementation" recited in claim 1 has been removed. Regarding the term "feel," this term is a well known expression in the field of web and GUI technology. Websites, templates, etc. may be created with a particular look and feel. Applicants respectfully submit that the term "feel" is known by one skilled in the art and does not require further definition in the claims. The step of "receiving events...modeled architecture" as recited in claim 1 has been amended to indicate that events are received at an "event service delivery agent" and the events are forwarded to "a model component of the architecture in the form of callbacks." Applicants submit that the steps of receiving events and forwarding recited in claim 1 are clear and concise. The terms "model" and "view" of claim 6 have been amended to recite the phrase "model component" and "view component." Applicants respectfully request that the §112 rejection of claims 1 and 6, and all claims dependent therefrom, be withdrawn.

Claim 3 has been amended to replace the term "auto-cycle" with the phrase "continuous, free-running." Applicants respectfully submit that the features of claim 3 are clear and concise and request that the §112 rejection of claim 3 be withdrawn.

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,336,138 to Caswell et al. ("Caswell"). Claim 1 recites, in part, the features of "a method for visualizing any architecture during conceptual, development and deployment phases of a system" and "reading configuration information during initialization at application startup, wherein the configuration information is adaptable to a plurality of different middlewares."

5

In contrast, Caswell teaches a system for monitoring and managing quality of service for service providers, such as Internet Service Providers (ISP). *See* Caswell, col. 3, lines 6-10, and col. 3, line 59 - col. 4, line 3. Caswell teaches monitoring and managing of a system that has been previously deployed, whereas the architecture of the presently claimed invention is utilized during conception, development, and deployment. Caswell does not teach or suggest a system for use during conception or development as the system of Caswell utilizes measurements and quality of service assessments from a previously deployed system.

Furthermore, Caswell does not teach that the configuration information is adaptable to a plurality of different middlewares. Nowhere does Caswell mention middlewares and therefore no teaching or suggestion of adapting the configuration information according to a middleware is disclosed. In addition, the configuration information as taught by the originally filed specification of the present application relates to configuration of the implementations of the components (e.g., controller implementation), whereas the configurator of Caswell relates to utilizing configuration information to schedule tests, retrieve test results, set thresholds and/or alarms, etc. *See* Caswell, col. 8, lines 43-60. As such, the configuration information as recited in claim 1 is not analogous to the configuration information as taught by Caswell. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 distinguishes over Caswell and request that the §102 rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claims 2-5 are directly dependent from claim 1 and should distinguish over Caswell for at least the same reasons as stated above. Applicants respectfully request that the §102 rejection of claims 2-5 be withdrawn.

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Caswell in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,643,668 to Sluiman ("Sluiman"). Applicants respectfully submit that the earliest effective date for Sluiman is April 3, 2001, whereas the present application was filed on October 30, 2000. As such, Sluiman is not a valid prior art reference and Applicants request that the §103 rejection be withdrawn.

New independent claim 7 recites, in part, the features of "an event service interface for receiving middleware or protocol dependent events, the event service interface for translating the middleware or protocol dependent events into middleware or protocol independent events"

and "a controller for managing the behavior of the application, an implementation of the controller being adaptable based on the middleware communicating with the application." As noted above with respect to claim 1, Caswell does not teach or suggest middlewares, implementations of components based on middlewares, or adapting a controller based on a particular middleware. Applicants submit that claim 7, and all claims dependent therefrom, should distinguish over the cited art.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

Dated: 7/14/04

Respectfully submitted,

By
Ashley N. Moore
Registration No.: 51,667
JENKENS & GILCHRIST, A PROFESSIONAL
    CORPORATION
1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 3200
Dallas, Texas 75202
(214) 855-4500
Attorneys For Applicant